ORDER FOR SUPPLIES OR SERVICES

IMPORTANT: Mark all packages and papers with contract and/or order numbers.

1. DATE OF ORDER 01/14/2015	**2. CONTRACT NO.** *(If any)* EP-W-11-016

3. ORDER NO. 0017

4. REQUISITION/REFERENCE NO. See Schedule

5. ISSUING OFFICE *(Address correspondence to)*
HPOD
US Environmental Protection Agency
Headquarters Procurement Operations
Ariel Rios Building
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington DC 20460

6. SHIP TO:

a. NAME OF CONSIGNEE
Laura Free, TOCOR

b. STREET ADDRESS
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W.
MC 1806A
Email: Free.laura@Epa.gov
Phone: 202-564-2653

c. CITY Washington **d. STATE** DC **e. ZIP CODE** 20460

7. TO: HEATHER TEED

a. NAME OF CONTRACTOR
BOOZ-ALLEN & HAMILTON, INC.

b. COMPANY NAME

c. STREET ADDRESS
8283 GREENSBORO DRIVE

d. CITY McLean **e. STATE** VA **f. ZIP CODE** 22102

f. SHIP VIA

8. TYPE OF ORDER

☐ **a. PURCHASE**
REFERENCE YOUR:
_____

Please furnish the following on the terms and conditions specified on both sides of this order and on the attached sheet, if any, including delivery as indicated.

☒ **b. DELIVERY**
Except for billing instructions on the reverse, this delivery order is subject to instructions contained on this side only of this form and is issued subject to the terms and conditions of the above-numbered contract.

9. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA
See Schedule

10. REQUISITIONING OFFICE
Reconstruct Originating Office

11. BUSINESS CLASSIFICATION *(Check appropriate box(es))*
☐ a. SMALL ☐ b. OTHER THAN SMALL ☐ c. DISADVANTAGED ☐ d. WOMEN-OWNED ☐ e. HUBZone
☐ f. SERVICE-DISABLED VETERAN-OWNED ☐ g. WOMEN-OWNED SMALL BUSINESS (WOSB) ELIGIBLE UNDER THE WOSB PROGRAM ☐ h. EDWOSB

12. F.O.B. POINT
Destination

13. PLACE OF		14. GOVERNMENT B/L NO.	15. DELIVER TO F.O.B. POINT ON OR BEFORE *(Date)*	16. DISCOUNT TERMS
a. INSPECTION Destination	**b. ACCEPTANCE** Destination			

17. SCHEDULE *(See reverse for Rejections)*

ITEM NO. (a)	SUPPLIES OR SERVICES (b)	QUANTITY ORDERED (c)	UNIT (d)	UNIT PRICE (e)	AMOUNT (f)	QUANTITY ACCEPTED (g)
	DUNS Number: (b)(4) TOPO: Laura Free Max Expire Date: 07/14/2015 Continued ...					

18. SHIPPING POINT	19. GROSS SHIPPING WEIGHT	20. INVOICE NO.		17(h) TOTAL *(Cont. pages)* ◀

21. MAIL INVOICE TO:

a. NAME RTP Finance Center

b. STREET ADDRESS *(or P.O. Box)*
US Environmental Protection Agency
RTP-Finance Center
Mail Drop D143-02
109 TW Alexander Drive

c. CITY Durham **d. STATE** NC **e. ZIP CODE** 27711

SEE BILLING INSTRUCTIONS ON REVERSE

$149,635.00

17(i) GRAND TOTAL ◀
$149,635.00

22. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BY *(Signature)* ▶ 01/14/2015 ELECTRONIC SIGNATURE

23. NAME *(Typed)*
Bradley Austin
TITLE: CONTRACTING/ORDERING OFFICER

AUTHORIZED FOR LOCAL REPRODUCTION
PREVIOUS EDITION NOT USABLE

OPTIONAL FORM 347 (Rev. 2/2012)
Prescribed by GSA/FAR 48 CFR 53.213(f)

IMPORTANT: Mark all packages and papers with contract and/or order numbers.

DATE OF ORDER	CONTRACT NO.		ORDER NO.
01/14/2015	EP-W-11-016		0017

ITEM NO. (a)	SUPPLIES/SERVICES (b)	QUANTITY ORDERED (c)	UNIT (d)	UNIT PRICE (e)	AMOUNT (f)	QUANTITY ACCEPTED (g)

	Admin Office:
	    HPOD
	    US Environmental Protection Agency
	    Headquarters Procurement Operations
	    Ariel Rios Building
	    1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
	    Washington DC 20460
	Period of Performance: 01/14/2015 to
	07/14/2015					

0001	ORPM Needs Assessment: This task order is issued on a firm fixed price basis. The contractor's proposal dated November 21, 2014, is hereby incorporated by reference. Requisition No: PR-OA-14-00136, PR-OEI-15-00230 Accounting Info: 15-16-B-H3A-ZZZHF8-2511-LSMM0000-H3ABU 02-15H3CAE014-001 BFY: 15 EFY: 16 Fund: B Budget Org: H3A Program (PRC): ZZZHF8 Budget (BOC): 2511 Job #: LSMM0000 Cost: H3ABU02 DCN - Line ID: 15H3CAE014-001 Funding Flag: Complete Funded: $35,000.00 Accounting Info: 14-15-B-11N-402MG9-2505-1411N41032-001 BFY: 14 EFY: 15 Fund: B Budget Org: 11N Program (PRC): 402MG9 Budget (BOC): 2505 DCN - Line ID: 1411N41032-001 Funding Flag: Complete Funded: $114,635.00 The obligated amount of award: $149,635.00. The total for this award is shown in box 17(i).				149,635.00	

TOTAL CARRIED FORWARD TO 1ST PAGE (ITEM 17(H))	▷	$149,635.00	

AUTHORIZED FOR LOCAL REPODUCTION
PREVIOUS EDITION NOT USABLE

OPTIONAL FORM 348 (Rev. 4/2006)
Proscribed by GSA FAR (48 CFR) 53.213(f)

Office of Policy, Office of Regulatory Policy & Management Alternatives Analysis for Databases and Workflows

1.0   STATEMENT OF OBJECTIVES

1.1   Overview

Background

The Office of Regulatory and Policy Management (ORPM) in EPA's Office of Policy (OP) leads the Agency's Action Development Process (ADP), which is EPA's regulatory, policy, and guidance development process. ORPM provides numerous services in support of the ADP including tracking regulatory actions, generating status reports for senior management, preparing and transmitting documents to the Office of the Federal Register and Office of Management and Budget, and submitting EPA's semiannual regulatory agenda. ORPM currently maintains 5 Lotus Notes-based databases (ADP Tracker, Federal Register Dailies, Scout, Congressional Review Act database, and the ORPM Policy Review). Through these databases, OP tracks, supports and manages two of the Agency's core regulatory functions – regulatory development and publication of all the Agency's Federal Register documents. ORPM also works closely with the Office of Information Collection (OIC) in EPA's Office of Environmental Information (OEI) which supports the Agency's electronic docketing activities and Information Collection Request (ICR) processing. Each of these functions are supported by their own tracking and submission system (FDMS and ICRAS).

Problem and Direction

EPA access to Lotus Notes is finite, expected to expire in 2019, and ORPM must conduct an alternatives analysis to identify new technologies to support its existing database group. Furthermore, the current architecture of these systems does not allow for the most efficient business practices. First, there are routine occurances of duplicative data entry or manually directed transfers of documents and information. Second, the current architecture does not allow for the input or export of standardized metadata that can be used in other applications. This new investment will allow ORPM to consolidate the Agency's major regulatory tracking and reporting functions into one or more systems to allow for streamlined data entry and to simplify data extraction for reporting to senior management, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), and our public websites. This project also represents an opportunity to consider the incorporation of workflows into the system, reducing duplicative actions and creating a centralized content generation and recordkeeping system to include pre-population and auto-population from one part to another within the system. ORPM will evaluate whether the rule development systems can be better integrated with other federal regulatory systems such as the Federal Docket Management system and the Office of the Federal Register as part of an effort to modernize data submission and to create consistency in

data access and availability.

ORPM currently tracks EPA actions under development through five databases, and some information is published on publically available websites such as the Regulatory Development and Retrospective Review Tracker (Reg DARRT) on epa.gov and the Unified Regulatory Agenda on reginfo.gov. There are currently about 370 actions under development at various stages, and these databases and websites track either this entire universe of actions or subsets of those actions (for example, actions with impacts on small businesses). The primary system for tracking regulatory development is the ADP Tracker database. ADP Tracker was launched in 2012 and improved the quality of the agency-wide data related to the ADP by providing a consistent data input and reporting structure, as well as increased security and functionality. ADP Tracker allows EPA to track regulatory milestones, manage workgroups, and create workflows for regulatory processes. Through ADP Tracker, ORPM manages more than 300 data elements for most regulatory actions.

ORPM also transmits all Agency actions to the Office of the Federal Register (OFR) for publication in the Federal Register (FR). The EPA FR Liaison and the FR team receive, review, send, and track such documents as notices, proposed rules and rules for publication in the Federal Register. EPA publishes about 1,600-2,000 documents annually. The Federal Register Dailies (FR Dailies) database tracks the review and publication of these documents. Expansion and modification of the digital signature program currently in place at EPA will be a consideration in any new system. A portion of the alternatives analysis will consider this new development in business practices and recommend an alternative that provides ORPM the capacity to handle a larger quantity of digitally-signed documents and, eventually, transition away from paper-based submissions. For more information, please see Appendix 1. For each final rule that is published in the Federal Register, ORPM is also responsible for submitting copies of the rule to Congress as required under the Congressional Review Act (CRA). A copy of each final rule is distributed to the House, the Senate and Government Accountability Office (GAO). The CRA database tracks the submission of these documents.

Another key regulatory database managed by ORPM is Scout. The Scout database is used to generate reports for senior management on upcoming regulatory milestones and other significant EPA actions. Many of the data fields in Scout overlap with ADP Tracker but Scout also includes some unique records and data fields. The final component of ORPM's suite of regulatory tools is the ORPM Policy Review which is used to store final documents and to track actions through OP management approval to Office of Executive Secretariat (OEX) for signature by the Administrator or to OMB for interagency review. All of the regulatory tracking and reporting systems described above currently are housed in Lotus Notes. As the Agency moves closer to the complete phase out of Lotus Notes, ORPM has initiated the process of developing alternative systems to house these functions.

Another part of the regulatory development process is the development of the related Information Collection Request (ICR) in compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act.

An ICR must be submitted to and approved by OMB for each Agency rulemaking that involves the collection of information from the public. The ICR development and review process is tracked through OEI's Information Collection Request Review and Approval System (ICRAS). ICRAS provides data input and reporting structure, creates workflows, tracks milestones, and provides reminders/notifications for EPA's 400+ ICRs. ICRAS currently operates independently of all ORPM databases; however, OEI wants to consider the possibility of upgrading or replacing ICRAS in order to support closer integration with the functionalities of a centralized regulatory development system.

Overview of Project

ORPM is currently seeking contract support to conduct a baseline and alternatives analysis that can be used to evaluate replacement options for the Lotus Notes-based regulatory databases and tracking systems described in the preceding paragraphs. The first phase of this effort will be to document the current system architecture and work flows. The second will be to identify change requirements and potential efficiencies to be gained in a new system. The final phase will be to provide alternatives and corresponding cost estimates for the development and implementation of a new system that will be capable of meeting new requirements and capitalizing on opportunities for improvement.

1.2 Objectives

- Understand and document the business processes and IT system requirements necessary to support EPA's regulatory and action development process.
- Identify the major requirements not met by current IT systems.
- Propose alternatives to the current suite of systems that reduce inefficiencies, increase data interoperability, promote system adoption, and are responsive to EPA's emerging needs.
- Develop technical architecture options and estimates for cost of ownership for each option.

1.3 Requirements

This section defines the requirements of this task order, including tasks (or subtasks) to be performed and deliverables or services to be provided to meet the Task Order's Objectives. The contractor shall address these requirements in the Technical Approach section of their proposal.

Task 1: Contract-Level Project Management

The Contractor shall provide a single point of contact for the management of all aspects of the tasks under this task order (TO). That person shall be known as the Contractor Project Manager (PM). The Contractor PM shall report on all aspects of the TO to the designated EPA TO Project Officer (TOPO) or Alternate (ATOPO) in the absence of the TOPO.

The Contractor PM shall:

- Submit to the TOPO a detailed project schedule in draft format that allows for the completion of all work and deliverables required for this task order within 6 months of the TO's award
- Submit the above project schedule within ten (10) days after the TO's award; upon receiving comments from the TOPO, finalize the project schedule;
- Create and provide visuals for EPA staff to use to track the progress of the project;
- Ensure all deliverable are submitted in a timely manner as indicated in the project schedule;
- Submit to the TOPO, in writing, all requirements needed by the Contractor to accomplish the tasks defined in this TORFP;
- Attend periodic status meetings as requested by the TOPO; and
- Immediately notify the TOPO of any factor or change that may significantly affect the approved project schedule.

Task 1 Deliverable: The Contractor shall submit:

- A detailed project schedule for the project to be completed within six months to the TOPO as specified above.
- A draft stakeholder register so that EPA staff may begin identifying appropriate contacts.
- An outlined Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) for how the contactor plans to accomplish the tasks.
- A Network Diagram of the planned activities to accomplish the tasks.
- Additionally, following the completion of each subtask, and prior to beginning the next task, the contractor shall present a short briefing to ORPM team on the contractor's progress. The number of slides for the presentation shall be left to the Contractor's discretion to determine what is appropriate. There will be no formal review of the presentation prior to each meeting.

Task 2: Alternatives Analysis
The contractor shall work with ORPM staff to provide technical architecture options that will meet the requirements gathered by the contractor during this project. The contractor will provide estimates for the cost of ownership for each option. The following subtasks provide a logical progression to gather pieces needed for the alternatives analysis itself (subtask 4).

Subtask 1: Understand Current ORPM Systems

The contractor will evaluate the existing systems and interview users to understand current business processes and system requirements and to identify limitations in the

current system architecture. To help the contractor understand the current system requirements, ORPM staff will demonstrate the existing databases and answer questions that the contractor has about use of the database, including necessary access levels. In discussing the uses of each database, the contractor will be directed to further investigate database interactions with other systems within and outside of EPA, to be discussed further in Subtask 3. The contractor shall document must-have requirements, recordkeeping processes, and a separate set of preferences (like-to-have items) for new systems that integrate existing business processes. The contractor will also flag any inefficiencies noted during this requirements gathering, to be addressed during system development.

Existing databases that the Contractor shall evaluate when gathering requirements are:
- ADP Tracker, including the ADP Reporting Tool currently being developed
- Scout
- FR Dailies
- CRA
- ORPM Policy Review

The contractor shall organize and coordinate meetings, interviews, and requests for documentation with the TOPO to complete the task.

Subtask 2: Consider integration of ORPM Systems with other Regulation-Related systems

The contractor shall investigate the possibility of integrating the Information Collection Request Review and Approval System (ICRAS), currently housed in EPA's OEI, with ORPM regulatory management systems. The contractor shall gather requirements from the existing system. Based on the contractor's knowledge of the ORPM and ICRAS systems, as well as the experiences of staff involved in the project, the contractor shall identify opportunities to integrate components of ICRAS into a larger regulatory tracking system.

Subtask 3: Consider future requirements

The Contractor shall work with ORPM staff to identify any desired features or interactions that are not part of the current ORPM/Regulation-Related systems, in order to consider their incorporation into one of the suggested alternatives in subtask 5. ORPM staff shall provide the Contractor with information regarding existing efforts to streamline business processes, transform paper-based operations to electronic, and other desired business process improvements. The Contractor shall investigate the role of wizards, smart templates, or other related technology within a future system that would simplify the input of standardized metadata, tie content to tracking metadata, and support consistent text. This may include an investigation of past attempts at wizards and reasons programs have been slow to adopt these tools.

Subtask 4: Incorporate programmatic requirements

The contractor shall investigate how program offices at EPA are (or are not) using any of the 5 databases herein described. These discussions with program offices will summarize how the program office coordinates any required data entry and will note whether any program-specific tracking systems or techniques are used in conjunction with or instead of the current ORPM/Regulation Related systems and databases. Additionally, in these meetings, the contractor will note any user feedback that will increase the usability of a new system. The contractor will also explore compatibility requirements with any internal or external systems identified in Subtask 1 and gather requirements from those entities. Examples include OFR and the Federal Docket Management System (FDMS). The contractor will map the information flows from the current ORPM/Regulation Related systems and databases to these internal and external systems as specified by the TOPO.

Subtask 5: Alternatives Analysis

The contractor shall map current and envisioned system requirements gathered in subtasks 1-3 to available technologies to analyze alternatives for the existing databases identified in subtasks 1 and 2. This analysis shall consider the requirements identified in subtasks 1-3, any inefficiencies flagged in gathering these requirements, and any possibilities for integration and data sharing between internal and external systems as discussed in subtask 3. The analysis will identify and discuss between three (3) to five (5) options, in addition to the baseline (purchasing a separate license for Lotus Notes to ensure access for all current users).

The alternatives shall be based on criteria defined by ORPM, including:
- system requirements identified by
  - ORPM Staff (subtask 1),
  - Program staff (subtask 4), and
  - External stakeholders (subtask 4),
- opportunities for integration with other EPA tools such as SharePoint sites and epa.gov (subtask 3),
- emerging and envisioned needs such as digital submission of documents (subtask 2),
- the ability to integrate with other federal systems and applications (such as Federal Docket Management System, ROCIS, Office of the Federal Register) (subtask 4),
- the technological capabilities given EPA's IT infrastructure,
- the cost of building and maintaining the system (alternatives are evaluated compared to a baseline using total cost methodologies, generally over a ten-year period. From this, "return on investment" and other measure can be calculated.),
- the cost of the inefficiencies, such as mail, duplicative data entry, and proofing of data) of the baseline model, and
- the minimized maintenance of the system over time.

All relevant cost types should be considered, including: software licensing fees, hosting needs, initial design and development costs, migration costs/level of effort, long-term maintenance costs, etc.

In addition to costs, the analysis must include a detailed assessment (pros and cons) of the "fit" of the alternative to ORPM's desired state, including flexibility over time to adapt to changing or evolving business needs. The analysis will also include narrative on how the suggested options compare in addressing gaps in the current system.

The Contractor's alternatives analysis (in an MS Word format) shall include a section outlining recommended business practice improvements. The document shall be written in plain English so that the content of the text is clear to nontechnical reviewers. The document shall include graphs and charts typical to an alternatives analysis and no more than twenty (20) pages of narrative.

The Contractor shall submit the draft alternatives analysis to the TOPO at the date agreed upon in the project schedule. The TOPO shall have ten (10) business days to review the draft and submit comments to the Contractor. Within ten (10) days of receipt of the TOPO's comments, the Contractor shall prepare and submit to the TOPO a final alternatives analysis.

The Contractor shall expect to participate in one (1) meeting to present and discuss the final alternatives analysis. This meeting will be a formal briefing with OP managers and key staff. The meeting will last approximately two (2) hours, with a one (1) hour presentation and a one (1) hour discussion. The Contractor shall prepare approximately 20-30 slides for this meeting. There will be no review or follow-up from EPA after this meeting.

Task 2 Deliverables:

Subtask 1: Documentation of systems requirements

Subtask 2: Documentation of system requirements

Subtask 3: Addition of any requirements discussed to documentation of systems requirements in subtask 1

Subtask 4:
- Meeting minutes from each stakeholder meeting outside of ORPM (1-2 page summary), including
    - RSC representatives,
    - Other IO contacts for program offices,
    - E-Rulemaking PMO (Regulations.gov and Federal Docket Management System (FDMS))

- o EPA Docket Center
- o OCFO (group that does Reports to Congress)
- o Office of the Federal Register (OFR)
- Addition of any requirements discussed to documentation of systems requirements in subtask 1

Subtask 5: Alternatives Analysis
- <u>Format</u>: Word document and accompanying presentation (Microsoft PowerPoint) with alternatives and costs than can be presented to OP management.
- <u>Content</u>: Detailed system architecture with technology options (and costs for each option) that meet ORPM's principal requirements

1.4 Other Information

This section provides additional information on the requirements for this task order.

1.4.1 On-site Contractor Support

___ Yes ___x No. The task order requires on-site contractor support.

If yes, please describe the specific support to be provided on site. Note: All IBC vendors understand the requirement to attend on-site meetings.

1.4.2 Government Furnished Space or Property (GFP)

___ Yes ___x No. The task order involves the provision of government space.

Describe the government location where the support work shall be provided. Describe office facilities (e.g., cubicle) to be provided at the government site.

___ Yes ___x No. The task order involves the provision of GFP.

Please describe the specific property to be provided as well as state the requirements for maintaining and accounting for this property, if applicable.

1.4.3 Additional Progress or Financial Reporting

___ Yes ___x No. The task order requires additional progress or financial reporting.

If yes, please describe the type and frequency of the additional reporting required (e.g., Is Earned Value Management (EVM) reporting required? Will the contractor be asked to report spending by each deliverable or product produced?)

Note: The ITS-BISS contract requires that contractors provide a monthly progress report to the TOPO. Monthly reports describe progress on TO activities and funds spent. The CO can provide more information about content and format of the monthly contractor progress report if necessary.